INLAND CELLULAR TELEPHONE COMPANY
Corporate Offices

103 S 2nd St
P O Box 688
Roslyn WA 98941
Telephone (509) 649-2500
Fax (509) 649-3300

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

AUG - 1 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

August 1, 2003

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street S W.
Washington, DC 20554

By Electronic Submission

John Muleta, Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street S W
Washington, D.C 20554

David Solomon, Chief, Enforcement Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street S W
Washington, D C 20554

Re E911 Interim Report for Tier III Carriers
CC Docket No. 94-102
Eastern Sub-RSA Limited Partnership

Dear Ms Dortch

Pursuant to the Commission's *Order to Stay*, in the above referenced docket,[1] Eastern Sub-RSA Limited Partnership ("ESRLP") hereby submits its E911 Interim Report for Tier III carriers. This Report provides the Commission with the current status of ESRLP's E911 efforts and its progress towards compliance with the Commission's E911 Phase II benchmarks.

Please contact the undersigned if you should have any questions regarding this Report.

Sincerely,

Greg Maras

Greg Maras
Eastern-Sub RSA Limited Partnership
(509) 649-2211

[1] *Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, Phase II Compliance Deadlines for Non-Nationwide CMRS Carriers*, CC Docket No 94-102, *Order to Stay*, FCC 02-210, 17 FCC Rcd 14,841 (2002)

014

INTERIM REPORT FOR TIER III CARRIERS

EASTERN SUB-RSA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Eastern Sub-RSA Limited Partnership ("ESRLP") hereby provides the Commission with its E911 Interim Report ("Report") for Tier III carriers. As a Tier III carrier, ESRLP is submitting this one-time Report in order to provide the Commission with the current status of its E911 efforts and its progress towards compliance with the Commission's Phase II benchmarks ESRLP is the wireline licensee in the B2 portion of the Block B frequencies in the Washington 5 – Kittitas RSA (call sign KNKQ283). In preparing the instant Report, ESRLP has followed the guidelines provided by the Commission in its June 30, 2003 Public Notice.[1]

ESRLP takes its E911 responsibilities seriously and to assist in ensuring that E911 connectivity for Phase I and Phase II service is properly implemented, ESRLP is using the services of Telecommunications Service Incorporated ("TSI"). TSI is a third party vendor with years of experience in assisting wireless carriers, such as ESRLP, in their E911 implementation efforts by providing both project management and implementation services TSI has played a key role in ESRLP's E911 implementation process, coordinating the implementation process and assisting ESRLP with the technical problems as they arose. TSI, with the participation of the relevant Public Switched Safety Points ("PSAPs") and Local Exchange Carriers ("LECs"), developed an implementation process by which each party was assigned implementation tasks with mutually agreed upon deadlines To assure that the parties were all involved and kept current, TSI hosts bi-weekly conference calls with all the parties to discuss developments and gauge progress.

The number of Phase I and Phase II requests from PSAPs (including those the carrier may consider invalid):

ESRLP has received three (3) requests for E911 Phase I from PSAPS throughout the B2 portion of the WA-5 RSA. Additionally, ESRLP has not received any Phase II requests from any PSAPs in its market area.

Prior to the implementation process, ESRLP began drafting a Phase I Interconnection Agreement Template in June 2000, which was to be used by each of the PSAPs Through the hard work of both Maryls Davis, E-911 Program Manager in the King County E-911 Program Office, and ESRLP an agreement in principle was hammered out

The three E911 Phase I service requests were dated as follows: Adams County PSAP – October 28, 2002; Lincoln County PSAP – October 25, 2002; and Grant County

---

[1] *See* Public Notice, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Provides Further Guidance on Interim Report Filings by Small Sized Carriers, DA 03-2113, rel June 30, 2003

PSAP – December 26, 2002 [2] Prior to these requests being sent, however, TSI and ESRLP were already working with all the counties in ESRLP's service area to ensure timely and reliable E911 Phase I service. TSI and the PSAPs conducted regularly scheduled meetings to discuss implementation milestones and the work that needed to be done to achieve these milestones Specifically, TSI sent out surveys and information requests to the PSAPs and the LEC in order to ascertain the various elements and components of E911 Phase I that ESRLP would need to implement This information was deemed essential for ESRLP to begin implementation efforts and to establish the requisite implementation schedule

Originally, TSI had requested that the PSAPs return their surveys to TSI by July 2002. Of the three PSAPs, Grant County did not return its survey until February 3, 2003 and Lincoln County did not return its survey until February 24, 2003. Moreover, TSI requested that the PSAPS return their updated Master Street Address Guides ("MSAG") by February 2003. The MSAG is a critical document as it provides information regarding where emergency rescue efforts should be sent The only PSAP to meet this deadline for providing updated MSAGs was Adams County. The remaining two PSAPs untimely returned their updated MSAGs on March 10, 2003. Delays by the PSAPs in returning the requested information have significantly contributed to the delays associated with ESRLP's ability to provide Phase I E911 service because without this most basic information, such as the number of trunks from the selective router to the PSAP or the location of the ALI database, ESRLP was unable to proceed with implementation.

The history of E911 efforts in Washington State is replete with unexpected delays and uncertainties which ESRLP and the PSAPs have worked in good faith to overcome. In the summer of 2002 throughout the winter of 2002 there was widespread concern that the PSAPs would not receive sufficient monies from the state to permit the PSAPs to build or staff E911 facilities

Due in part to this uncertainty and due to the delays ESRLP was experiencing in obtaining responses from the PSAPs, in February 2003, ESRLP entered into Letter Agreements with each of the PSAPs These Letter Agreements acknowledged the delays and set June 2003 as the target date by which E911 Phase I service would be provided.[3] The Letter Agreements provided that ESRLP would continue to work diligently toward

---

[2] ESRLP notes that this is the second round of E911 Phase I requests issued by these PSAPs The initial requests were dated as follows Adams County PSAP – February 29, 2000, Lincoln County PSAP – April 25, 2000, and, Grant County PSAP – May 17, 2002 The PSAPs, however, were not ready to receive E911 Phase I information Accordingly, the second round of requests were sent once the PSAPs were prepared to receive this information

[3] The Letter Agreements utilized the flexibility afforded to the PSAPs and wireless carriers by the FCC. Although the Commission's rules require wireless carriers to provide Phase I E911 service within six months from the date of a valid request for such service, the Commission has also given counties and wireless carriers the flexibility to mutually agree to different timeframes in order to respond to real-world needs 47 C F R § 20 18(j)(5) *See also, Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, Petition of City of Richardson, Texas*, CC Docket No 94-102, *Order on Reconsideration*, 17 FCC Rcd 24282, 24282 (2002)

implementation of Phase I and ESRLP has worked with TSI and the PSAPs toward an implementation of E911 Phase I service by June 2003. The Letter Agreement served as a mutual recognition between ESRLP and the PSAP that E911 Phase I service would be initiated by June 2003 unless ESRLP is prevented, despite using reasonable efforts, from implementing E911 Phase I service due to the following. a) either the PSAP's or the LEC's inability to provide the requested information in a timely manner; b) any third party, such as the LEC or a Vendor of an ALI/DMS system provider, failing to complete its respective talk or provide capabilities as requested; or c) an Act of God. The Letter Agreement was sent to each PSAP and mentioned in TSI's bi-weekly calls as well as noted in the meeting minutes which are sent to each PSAP All the PSAP's assented to the Letter Agreement.

Although TSI did not receive the last PSAP survey until February 24, 2003, seven months after it was requested, by May 2003 ESRLP was able to make up for the lost time and was in position to implement by June 30th However, as the June 2003 deadline was approaching ESRLP encountered a problem with QWEST, the LEC that serves the area covered by ESRLP in the State of Washington Specifically, QWEST is using Intrado as its ALI-Database However, when TSI attempted to 'communicate' with Intrato's system, it was repeatedly blocked. Fortunately, TSI and Intrado have vigorously worked on fixing the connection problem and anticipate connectivity by August 1, 2003. Assuming the proposed connectivity method works, ESRLP will begin pre-testing and testing by August 4, 2003 In anticipation that all continues to go well, ESRLP believes that it will be ready to go to live users by mid-to-late August. The PSAPs have continually been updated on the status of ESRLP's connectivity issues with Intrado and have understand both the problems encountered and ESRLP's diligent efforts to rectify the unexpected delays

The carrier's specific technology choice (*i.e.*, network-based or handset-based solutions, as well as the type of technology used):

As previously reported to the Commission, ESRLP still intends on utilizing a handset-based location technology solution for Phase II E911 ESRLP has begun implementing this choice by ordering the requisite ALI-capable handsets and selling these handsets in its service area Thus, ESRLP has already met the September 1, 2003 benchmark to commence selling ALI-capable handsets. The problems experienced by ESRLP in ordering and obtaining these phones are two-fold. First is the supply-demand problem – there is too much demand for the ALI-capable handsets but still not enough supply to meet this demand. Particularly, as a Tier III carrier, there is even a more limited supply of ALI-capable handsets available for ESRLP to order. Manufacturers fill the orders of the larger carriers before turning to the mid-sized and smaller carriers. In some instances, these larger carriers can account for the majority of the handset supply available from a particular manufacturer Thus, Tier III carriers can be left to scrounge for the ALI-capable cellular handsets they need. Complicating matters is the fact that given ESRLP's relative size and the limited amount of handsets it requires, ESRLP cannot even work directly with the manufacturers to order the handsets and must go through third party vendors.

The second problem is the current cost of ALI-capable handsets. At present, ALI-capable handsets will cost ESRLP $100 more per phone than similarly configured non-ALI handsets currently offered by ESRLP to its customers. Currently, ESRLP has not perceived the demand by its customers for such an equipped phone, as Phase II service is not being provided in ESRLP's service area. Thus, in order to entice its customers to purchase the phone Inland will need to subsidize the costs of the phones, an expense that, in addition to the other E911 related costs, will disproportionately impact a small carrier such as ESRLP

Status on ordering and/or installing necessary network equipment

As ESRLP has not received any requests for Phase II E911 service, it has not begun to order the necessary software upgrades that will be needed to implement Phase II E911 service As outlined above, ESRLP and TSI are very close to successfully implementing Phase I E911 service throughout ESRLP's service area and anticipate completing this implementation by the end of August 2003. TSI has already begun preparations for moving on to implementation of Phase II service and will turn to implementation of such service upon completion of Phase I service. ESRLP will begin working on its E911 Phase II implementation in tandem with TSI despite the absence of any E911 Phase II service request from any of the PSAPs.

The immediate problem ESRLP currently anticipates in ordering and installing the necessary software upgrades is the ability of small carriers to be expeditiously scheduled by the vendor for installation [4] Because there is such a large demand for the necessary software to become Phase II compliant, small Tier III carriers such as ESRLP will be scheduled after Tier I or II carriers needs are met. ESRLP is concerned that it will be forced to wait until there is enough supply for it to receive the needed software upgrades

If the carrier is pursuing a handset-based solution, the Report must also include information on whether ALI-capable handsets are now available, and whether the carrier has obtained ALI-capable handsets or has agreements in place to obtain these handsets:

As noted above, ESRLP is pursuing a handset-based solution. While such handsets are available to large carriers, they are only available on a limited basis to Tier III carriers such as ESRLP. Given the fast-approaching September 1, 2003 deadline for selling ALI-capable handsets, many carriers have similarly requested a supply of ALI-capable handsets. From ESRLP's discussions with its third party vendors, supply is straining to meet the demand. Thus, by the time the orders of the smaller carriers are

[4] ESRLP leases capacity on the switch of Washington RSA No 8 Limited Partnership ("WA8LP") and the timing of its Phase II upgrades will be on the same schedule as WA8LP *See* E911 Interim Report for Washington RSA No 8 Limited Partnership, filed August 1, 2003 Inland Cellular Corporation is the general partner for both ESRLP and WA8LP

ready to be filled, there may not be sufficient ALI-capable phones to completely meet the needs of the Tier III carriers

ESRLP does perceive a problem in marketing ALI-capable handsets to its customers because there is currently no perceived benefit to the subscriber to purchase a phone with capabilities it cannot currently utilize. E911 Phase II service has not been requested by the PSAPs in ESRLP's service area and as such the ALI-capable phones will not be capable of being used to their full potential. ESRLP believes it will be hard to market the benefits of an ALI-capable phone if those benefits cannot currently be utilized by customers If the prices of ALI capable handsets do not fall quickly, ESRLP will be in the untenable position of either having to request further extensions of the benchmarks or diverting capital earmarked for new cells and maintenance to underwrite the purchase of Phase II capable handsets which will not, for the foreseeable future, have their Phase II E911 capabilities used.

The estimated date on which Phase II service will first be available in the carrier's network:

Without a valid PSAP request for E911 Phase II service, it is difficult for ESRLP to estimate when such service will be available Should a PSAP request such service in the near future, however, ESRLP believes that after the purchase of several software upgrades, its current infrastructure is capable of handling such calls, assuming the appropriate handsets are available and being used If any additional changes to ESRLP's system may be necessary in the future to accommodate Phase II implementation, ESRLP stands ready to meet any such current PSAP request.

Information on whether the carrier is on schedule to meet the ultimate implementation date of December 31, 2005.

ESRLP believes that the 95% penetration rate for ALI-capable phones by the December 31, 2005 deadline is achievable if adequate handsets can be obtained and economic issues can be overcome However, a shortfall of ALI-capable handsets or the possible economic impact of the costs associated with obtaining the number of phones needed to meet the December 31, 2005 benchmark could stymie ESRLP's best efforts to meet the benchmark dates. ESRLP will provide the Commission with additional updates if any hurdles appear which could endanger its ability to meet the benchmark deadlines.

DECLARATION OF GREGORY MARAS

I, Gregory Maras, am an officer of Inland Cellular Telephone Company, the general partner of Eastern Sub-RSA Limited Partnership, and I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief the information contained on this form and the attached document is complete and accurate.

Signed. _____

Date _____